

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Various claims are being amended as shown above. The claim amendments clarify the claim language and are not intended to limit the scope of the claims, unless the claim language is expressly quoted in the following remarks to distinguish over the cited art.

No new matter is introduced by the amendment shown above.

#### Claim rejections 35 USC § 103

In section 2 of the rejection, Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Narayanaswamy et al. US Patent No. 6,144,358 (hereinafter Narayanaswamy) in view of Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,466,292 B1) (hereinafter referred to as Kim). Applicant(s) respectfully traverse(s) the rejection.

Section 2 of the rejection admits that Narayanaswamy does not expressly disclose a "first display component having multi-sided functionality."

Claim 1 recites that *"when said front cover is moved ... an image on a first viewing side ... is transferred to a second viewing side."*

Narayanaswamy discloses a device that has "three distinct displays ..., display 102 is able to display conventional text and/or graphical images, ..., displays 104 and 106 display images when device 100 is in its open configuration

in which device 100 operates as a ... PDA.” (See Narayanaswamy, col. 2, lines 22-31). “Each of displays 104 and 106 displays part ... of each PDA image” and “the image thus displayed overflows from one display to the other, giving the appearance of a single large display displaying the full image.” (See Narayanaswamy, col. 2, lines 32-38 and FIGS 1A-1B).

The rejection refers to the word “Shankar” on the display of Figure 1 in Narayanaswamy. The word “Shankar” is not transferred from display 102 to 104. The two displays, display different sets of information. Display 102 displays information regarding the mobile owner and his phone number whereas display 104 displays information regarding “Shankar’s” website. Therefore, the image of Narayanaswamy is not “*transferred*” as claimed.

Therefore, Narayanaswamy does not disclose nor suggest transferring an image from a first viewing side to a second viewing side of a display component. In Narayanaswamy, one display is capable of displaying text and/or graphical images whereas the other displays images when device 100 is open. Each of those displays, display different parts of the entire image. Narayanaswamy discloses that the image “overflows ... giving the appearance of a single large display displaying the full image.” In contrast, Claim 1 recites that “*an image on a first viewing side ... is transferred to a second viewing side.*”

Kim discloses a “liquid crystal display device 100 ... divided into a first region A and a second region B at a predetermined ratio by setting a reference

line R so that characters, number or figures are displayed in direction A and direction B.” (See Kim, col. 4, lines 59-62). “The controller 140 ... activates the first region A viewable on the inner surface of the folding cover 210 in accordance with a signal from the switch 220, ... alternatively ... the controller 140 activates the second region B viewable on the outer surface of the folder cover 210 to provide information on a calling party ... in case of a termination signal.” (See Kim, col. 5, lines 63 to col. 6, line 7).

Kim likewise does not disclose nor suggest a system where the image is “*transferred*” as claimed. Kim discloses that the display in region A displays characters, number or figures when the switch is on. Region B displays information on a calling party when the switch is turned off. In contrast Claim 1 recites that “*an image ... is transferred to a second viewing side.*”

Neither Narayanaswamy nor Kim suggest or disclose that “*when said front cover is moved ... an image on a first viewing side ... is transferred to a second viewing side*” as claimed. Therefore, the defects of Narayanaswamy are not cured by the addition of Kim. Accordingly, Claim 1 is patentable over Narayanaswamy in view of Kim under 35 USC §103. As such allowance of Claim 1 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 2-5 depend from Claim 1 and are each patentable over Narayanaswamy in view of Kim under 35 USC §103 for at least the same

reasons that Claim 1 is patentable. As such allowance of Claims 2-5 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 4 is further distinguishable over Narayanaswamy by at least reciting that the *"display control circuit ... activates said front display portion ... while said display control circuit deactivates said rear display portion."*

Narayanaswamy neither discloses nor suggests deactivating the rear display portion as claimed. The defects of Narayanaswamy are not cured by the addition of Kim. Accordingly, Claim 4 is patentable over Narayanaswamy in view of Kim under 35 USC §103. As such allowance of Claim 4 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 5 is further distinguishable over Narayanaswamy by at least reciting that the *"display control circuit ... activates said rear display portion of said first display ... and said front display portion of said second display ... while said display control circuit deactivates said front display portion of said first display."*

Narayanaswamy neither discloses nor suggests deactivating the front display portion as claimed. The defects of Narayanaswamy are not cured by the addition of Kim. Accordingly, Claim 5 is patentable over Narayanaswamy in view of Kim under 35 USC §103. As such allowance of Claim 5 is earnestly solicited.

In section 3 of the rejection, Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Narayanaswamy in view of Kim and Moscovich et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,343,006 B1) (hereinafter referred to as Moscovich). Applicant(s) respectfully traverse(s) the rejection.

The rejection admits that Narayanaswamy does not expressly disclose “a first display component having multi-sided functionality.” To overcome deficiencies of Narayanaswamy, the rejection relies on Kim and Moscovich.

Claim 6 recites that *“when said front cover is moved ... an image on a first viewing side of said first display component is transferred to a second viewing side of said first display component.”* Claim 6 further recites that a *“second display component ... having multi-sided viewing functionality comprising a front display panel and a rear display panel.”* Claim 6 also recites that a *“display control circuit ... adapted to activate ... said second display component ... responsive to the orientation of said front cover.”*

As discussed above, neither Narayanaswamy nor Kim suggest or disclose that *“when said front cover is moved ... an image on a first viewing side ... is transferred to a second viewing side”* as claimed. The defects of Narayanaswamy are not cured by the addition of Kim.

The rejection further admits that Narayanaswamy does not expressly disclose a “second display component coupled to palmtop computer system,

second display component having multi-sided viewing functionality comprising a front display panel and a rear display panel.”

Moscovich is directed to a computer that “incorporates a center LCD panel 170 ... pivotably supported on opposite sides ... are a pair of LCD panels 176 ... which may be ... folded over the center LCD panel 170.” (See Moscovich, col. 11, lines 36-49).

However, Moscovich does not disclose nor suggest a “*second display ... comprising a front display panel and a rear display panel*” as claimed. Furthermore, Moscovich does not disclose nor suggest activating the second display in response to the orientation of the front cover as claimed. Therefore, the defects of Narayanaswamy in view of Kim are not cured by the addition of Moscovich.

Accordingly, Claim 6 is patentable over Narayanaswamy in view of Kim and Moscovich under 35 USC §103. As such allowance of Claim 6 is earnestly solicited.

In section 4 of the rejection, Claims 7-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Narayanaswamy, Kim and Moscovich as aforementioned in Claim 6 in view of Albert et al. (US Patent no. 6,252,564 B1). Applicant(s) respectfully traverse(s) the rejection.

Claims 7-11 depend from Claim 6 and are each patentable over Narayanaswamy, Kim and Moscovich under 35 USC §103 for at least the same reasons that Claim 6 is patentable. As such allowance of Claims 7-11 is earnestly solicited.

In section 5 of the rejection, Claims 12-13, and 15-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Narayanaswamy, Kim, Moscovich, and Albert et al. as aforementioned in Claim 8 further yet in view of Albert (US Patent no. 6,392,786 B1) (hereinafter Albert). Applicant(s) respectfully traverse(s) the rejection.

Claims 12-13 and 15-18 depend from Claims 6 and 12 respectively and are each patentable for at least the same reasons that Claims 6 and 12 are patentable over Narayanaswamy, Kim, Moscovich, and Albert et al. further yet in view of Albert under 35 USC §103. As such allowance of Claims 12-13 and 15-18 is earnestly solicited.

The rejection admits that Narayanaswamy, Kim, Moscovich, and Albert et al. "do not show first colored liquid and second colored liquid where sealed chamber is predominately filled with first liquid and second colored liquid is black ink." To overcome these deficiencies, the rejection relies on Albert.

Claims 12-13 and 15 recite a sealed chamber comprising *“a fluid, said fluid comprising a first colored liquid and a, at least, second colored liquid.”*

Albert discloses an encapsulated electrophoretic display, which encloses a “colored liquid 114 in which are suspended charged colored particles 116 of a color different from the that of the liquid 114.” (See Albert, col. 7, lines 18-25). “A dark particle of the dyed type may be constructed from any light absorbing material, such as carbon black.” (See Albert, col. 10, lines 40-41).

Albert does not disclose nor suggest *“a first colored liquid, and a, at least, second colored liquid”* as claimed because Albert is directed to a “liquid” and a “suspended charged colored particle.” Therefore, the defects of Narayanaswamy, Kim, Moscovich, and Albert et al. are not cured by the addition of Albert. Accordingly, Claims 12-13 and 15 are patentable over Narayanaswamy, Kim, Moscovich, and Albert et al. in view of Albert under 35 USC §103. As such allowance of Claims 12-13 and 15 is earnestly solicited.

The rejection admits that Narayanaswamy, Kim, Moscovich, and Albert et al. “do not show black ink is transparently encapsulated, electrostatically charged and attracted to voltage provided by display control circuit.” To overcome these defects, the rejection relies on Albert.



Claim 16 recites that *"said black ink is transparently encapsulated by a multisided viewing display."*

As discussed above, Albert discloses electrophoretic display.

Albert does not disclose nor suggest *"black ink ... transparently encapsulated by ... multisided viewing display"* as claimed. Therefore, the defects of Narayanaswamy, Kim, Moscovich, and Albert et al. are not cured by the addition of Albert. As such allowance of Claim 16 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 18 recites that *"said ... black ink is attracted to said voltage provided by said display control circuit."*

Albert discloses an electrophoretic display, where the encapsulated electrophoretic medium be provided with first and second electrodes. (See Albert, col. 4, lines 20-23). "The electrophoretic display may also comprise first and second substrates disposed on opposed sides of the electrophoretic medium." (See Albert, col. 4, lines 25-28).

Albert neither discloses nor suggests transparently encapsulated *"black ink"* that is electrostatically charged that is attracted to voltage provided by the display control circuit where such voltage is more positive as claimed. Therefore, the defects of Narayanaswamy, Kim, Moscovich, and Albert et al. are not cured by the addition of Albert. As such allowance of Claim 18 is earnestly solicited.

In section 6 of the rejection, Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Narayanaswamy, Kim, Moscovich, Albert et al., and Albert in view of Heslin et al. (US Patent No. 6,326,613 B1) (hereinafter Heslin). Applicant(s) respectfully traverse(s) the rejection.

Claim 14 depend from Claim 12 and is patentable under 35 USC §103 over cited art for at least the same reasons that Claim 12 is patentable.

The rejection admits that Narayanaswamy, Kim, Moscovich, Albert et al., and Albert “do not show first colored liquid is white ink.” To overcome these defects, the rejection relies on Heslin.

Claim 14 is directed to a *“first colored liquid and a, at least, a second colored liquid ... wherein said first colored liquid is white ink.”*

Heslin discloses “microcapsules ... filled with a dark ink and that have in that ink white particles.” (See Heslin, col. 8, lines 2-3).

Heslin does not disclose nor suggest, *“a first colored liquid”* and *“a second colored liquid”* as claimed but rather discloses “a dark ink ... that have in that ink white particles.” Therefore, the defects of Narayanaswamy, Kim, Moscovich, Albert et al., and Albert are not cured by the addition of Heslin. As such allowance of Claim 14 is earnestly solicited.

In section 7 of the rejection, Claims 19-20, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Narayanaswamy in view of Kim and Yamamoto (US Patent No. 6,297,945) (hereinafter Yamamoto). Applicant(s) respectfully traverse(s) the rejection.

As to Claim 19, the rejection admits that Narayanaswamy “does not show a second display component having multi-sided functionality and upon flippable cover opening to open state, front display becomes deactivated, back display panel becomes activated and displays first images and first display component becomes activated for the display of second images.”

Claim 19 recites that “*display panel is active to display first images provided said flippable cover is in said closed state ... upon said flippable cover opening ... said back display panel becomes activated and displays said first images and said first display component becomes activated for the display of second images.*” Furthermore, Claim 19 is directed to a “*flippable cover comprising a flexible second display component.*”

The defects of Narayanaswamy are not cured by the addition of Kim as discussed before.

The rejection admits that neither Narayanaswamy nor Kim show “a flexible second display component.”

Yamamoto discloses that a “second display 10 may be integral with the first display 5.” (See Yamamoto, col. 3, lines 24-25). “Each of the first and second displays 5 and 10 may be a thinner display (i.e., a polymer-film liquid crystal display) so that the flip panel 4 can be made thinner.” (See Yamamoto, col. 3, lines 45-47).

Yamamoto does not disclose nor suggest a “*flexible*” second display component as claimed but rather discloses a “thinner display.” Therefore, the defects of Narayanaswamy in view of Kim are not cured by the addition of Yamamoto. Accordingly Claim 19 is patentable over Narayanaswamy in view of Kim and Yamamoto under 35 USC §103. As such allowance of Claim 19 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 20 depend from Claim 19 and is patentable for at least the same reasons that Claim 19 is patentable. As such allowance of Claim 20 is earnestly solicited.

As to Claim 25, the rejection admits that Narayanaswamy “does not show a first side of cover having multi-sided functionality and flexible cover so as to deactivated first side and to activate second side of cover and display screen.”

Claim 25 recites a “*flexible cover mounted display having multi-sided viewing functionality comprising a first and a second side ... such that said*

*flexible cover mounted display having multi-sided viewing functionality ... and opening said flexible cover ... deactivated said first side and to activate said second side of said flexible cover to display first images."*

The defects of Narayanaswamy in view of Kim are not cured by the addition of Yamamoto as discussed above. As such allowance of Claim 25 is earnestly solicited.

In section 8 of the rejection, Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Narayanaswamy and Kim, Yamamoto as aforementioned in Claims 19 and 23 in view of Heslin.

Claim 21 depend from Claim 20 and is patentable for at least the same reasons that Claim 20 is patentable.

The defects of Narayanaswamy, Kim, and Yamamoto mentioned before are not cured by the addition of Heslin. As such allowance of Claim 21 is earnestly solicited.

In section 9 of the rejection Claims 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Yamamoto in view of Moscovich, and Kim.

Claim 22 recites a *“first flippable cover”* and a *“second flippable cover”* comprising a *“flexible display.”* Furthermore, Claim 22 recites that *“said front display panel of said second cover is active to display first images provided said first and second covers are closed ... upon said second cover opening, ... said back display panel of said second cover becomes activated and displays said first images.”*

As discussed above, Yamamoto does not disclose nor suggest a *“flexible display”* as claimed.

The rejection admits that “Yamamoto does not teach a second flippable cover hinged to housing opposite to first flippable cover and having an open state and a closed state, second flippable cover with a third flexible display component having multisided viewing functionality comprising a front display panel and back display panel.” To overcome these defects, the rejection relies on Moscovich.

Moscovich discloses that “the computer incorporates a center LCD panel 170 pivotably mounted by hinge 172 ... pivotably supported on opposite sides of the center LCD panel 170 are a pair of LCD panels 176.” (See Moscovich, col. 11, lines 35-49).

Moscovich does not disclose nor suggest *“a ... flippable cover ... comprising a ... flexible display component having multi-sided viewing functionality”* as claimed. The defects of Yamamoto are not cured by the addition of Moscovich.

The rejection further admits that “Yamamoto and Moscovich et al. do not show a second flexible display having multisided functionality and front panel of second cover is active to display first images provided first and second cover are closed; upon second cover opening, front display panel of second cover becomes deactivated, back display panel of second cover becomes activated and displays first images and first display panel of the first cover becomes activated for the display of second image; upon first cover opening while second cover is open, front display panel of first cover becomes deactivated, back display panel of first cover becomes activated and displays second images and first display component becomes activated for the display third images.”

Kim does not disclose nor suggest a system where *“front display ... becomes deactivated, said back display ... becomes activated”* as claimed. Hence Kim does not disclose transferring *“first images”* as discussed above. Therefore, the defects of Yamamoto in view of Moscovich are not cured by the addition of Kim. Accordingly Claim 22 is patentable over Yamamoto in view of Moscovich, and Kim under 35 USC §103. As such allowance of Claim 22 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 23 depend from Claim 22 and is patentable for at least the same reasons that Claim 22 is patentable. As such allowance of Claim 23 is earnestly solicited.

In section 10 of the rejection, Claim 24 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Moscovich, Kim, and Yamamoto as aforementioned in Claims 19 and 23 in view of Heslin.

Claim 24 depend from Claim 23 and is patentable for at least the same reasons that Claim 23 is patentable. Therefore, the defects of Moscovich, Kim, and Yamamoto as discussed above are not cured by the addition of Heslin. As such allowance of Claim 24 is earnestly solicited.

For the above reasons, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103.



CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested. Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-25 overcome the rejections and objections of record and, therefore, allowance of Claims 1-25 is earnestly solicited.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MARABITO & HAO L.L.P.

Dated: OCT 6, 2005

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A.A. Tabarrok', enclosed within a large, hand-drawn oval.

Amir A. Tabarrok  
Registration No. 57,137

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
(408) 938-9060